

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 remain pending. Claim 2 is amended. No claims are canceled or added.

The specification is objected to because a more descriptive title is desired. As shown above, the title to be more descriptive.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Jones (U.S. Patent No. 4,640,725). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 2 describe an optical fiber anchor device comprising a “hot-melt type bonding agent” in a form of a tube having a “hollow portion” and a “heat-shrinkable tube.” (For support, see bonding agent 31 and heat shrinkable tube 33 of applicants’ specification.) The hot-melt type bonding agent and the heat-shrinkable tube together anchor optical fibers of a loose tube type originating from an optical cable. The hot-melt type bonding agent is inserted into the heat-shrinkable tube, and the optical fibers are inserted through the hot-melt type bonding agent. The hot-melt type bonding agent and the heat-shrinkable tube are then heated and formed integrally into a support, which anchors the optical fibers.

In contrast, the Jones fiber optic cable termination anchors a tight type optical cable instead of a loose tube type unit. That is, Jones discloses a structure wherein optical fiber 26 is surrounded by reinforcement strands 38, perhaps formed of Kevlar/aramid fiber (col. 3, lines 50-54), the strands are covered with a jacket 40, and all elements of the structure function integrally. A terminal connecting device 14 is fixed to the body of the cable, thereby anchoring the optical fiber. Generally speaking, a tight type optical fiber cable has a structure in which optical fibers, reinforcement strands, and an outer jacket function integrally. Such a structure is often adopted because it effectively anchors the optical fiber, reinforcement strands, and outer jacket as a unit, even though the elements could be anchored separately.

Unlike the tight type optical cable, the loose tube type optical cable has a structure in which the optical fibers hang in the hollow portion. The elements are not anchored as a single unit. Instead, the optical fiber and the body of the cable are basically anchored separately to a cable fixture. Therefore, the claimed invention anchors the optical fiber and the other elements separately. Such a structure is significantly different from a tight type optical cable.

In Jones, optical fiber 26 is inserted into tubular extension 20 of termination 14. Reinforcement strand groups 42 and 44 contact the outside of tubular extension 20, and those elements lie within adhesive layer 48 and heat-shrinkable tube 50. Reinforcement strand groups 42 and 44 are connected to jacket 40, without contacting optical fiber 26.

Additionally, regarding claim 2, the rejection relies on the groups 42, 44 of reinforcing strands 38 (see Figs. 4, 6, and 8) to teach the “support rod” as recited in the claim. However, unlike the support rod of the applicant’s invention (see, for example, element 32 in Figs. 8A, 8B, 9A-9D, 10, and 11B), reinforcing strands 38 are elements of the optical cable. In contrast, the support rod of the present invention implements is not formed from an element of the optical cable. To emphasize this distinction, claim 2 is now amended. Therefore, for this additional reason, the rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 or from claim 2 in the alternative, and claims 5-8 depend from claim 2. Therefore, the rejection of claims 4-8 should be withdrawn for at least the reason of their dependency.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Jones. The rejection is based on Jones anticipating parent claims 1 and 2.

However, as explained above, Jones does not anticipate claims 1 and 2. Therefore, the obviousness rejection of claim 3 based on the anticipation of claims 1 and 2 should be withdrawn.

In a separate matter, applicants amend the specification as shown above to address formalities.

In view of the remarks above, applicants now submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is hereby requested. If for any reason it is believed that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension, or any other fees which may be due, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Joseph L. Felber  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,109

1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: (202) 822-1100  
Fax: (202) 822-1111

JLF/

Q:\2003\032147\032147 response to 12-8-04 action.doc